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**ABSTRACT**

This research studies Good Governance and conflict resolution in Anambra state with focus on the Umuleri and Aguleri communities’ experience. Both communities were engulfed in intractable conflicts over the ownership of Otuocha land. Aside the contest over land, both communities have been engaged in the reconstruction of their history with each claiming to be the direct descendant of Eri. The research adopts qualitative evaluation method. The research basically draws from primary and secondary sources. The research hypothesized that good governance is the major ingredients in conflict resolution. The research from its findings discovered that good governance promotes peace in Nigeria policy and can be achieved through a transparency and accountability, Respect for the rule of law, Prudent management of resources, strict adherence to the principle of federal character in appointments. It further discovered that good governance is a critical element for peace, security and sustainable development. The research among others recommend that the present administration should endeavor to bridge this wide gap by showing true political will in resolving the mistrust, revamping the economy and effectively address the development needs and aspirations of citizens.

**CHAPTER ONE**

**INTRODUCTION**

**1.1Background to the Study**

Governance, according to the World Bank Report (2010) is the exercise of political power in the management of a nation’s affairs. This definition thus implies that governance encompasses the state’s institutional and structural arrangements, decision-making processes and implementation capacity, and relationship between the governing apparatus and the governed-that is the people in terms of their standard of living. Odock (2011) in his analysis sees good governance as “a system of government based on good leadership, respect for the rule of law and due process, the accountability of the political leadership to the electorate as well as transparency in the operations of government”. Transparency, Odock opined that it has to do with the leadership carrying out government business in an open, easy to understand and explicit manner, such that the rules made by government, the policies implemented by the government and the results of government activities are easy to verify to the ordinary citizens. Accountability as a component of good governance refers to the fact that those who occupy positions of leadership in the government must give account or subject themselves to the will and desire of the society and people they lead. Unfortunately, this is lacking in the public domain in Nigeria. Governance typically emphasizes leadership which suggests the way political leaders meaning the apparatus of the state, use or misuse power, to promote social and economic development or to engage in those agendas that largely undermine the realization of the good things of life for the people. Good governance is in tandem with democratic governance which is largely characterized by high valued principles such as rule of law, accountability, participation, transparency, human and civil rights. These governance qualities have the capacity to provide the development process of a country. Onifade (2011) has posed a critical question as to whether it’s possible to have good governance without good leadership. Our understanding of reality points to the fact that the former is logically derived from the latter because where there is effective and efficient leadership, there is bound to be good governance. Achebe (1983) had argued convincingly in his seminal book, ‘The Trouble with Nigeria’, that the failure of leadership to rise to its responsibility, to the challenges of personal exemplary life clearly shows why the nation has the problem of true leadership. It is exemplary leadership that can uplift the people, better the lives of the citizenry and see that the people as much as possible enjoy the public resources without ado as is the case in most advanced democracies such as the United States, Canada, Switzerland and some upcoming developing nations such as Singapore, Malaysia, Taiwan and Korea, theoretical explanations have been advanced by such scholars Migdal (1988), Zartman (1995) about the fact that in the absence of governance, a nation may experience state collapse or failure. This has been the lot of most African countries including Nigeria where lead governance has held sway. A state ideally is meant to be an organization, composed of several agencies led and coordinated by the state leadership (executive authority) which has capacity and authority to make and implement the finding rules for all the people and applying force if necessary to have its way. Zartman (1995) specifically notes that the status of a state is reviewed as failed or collapsed when it exhibits inability to fulfill the functions of a state such as the sovereign authority, decision-making institution and security guarantor for its population. This can lead to structure, authority (legitimate power), law and political order falling apart. On the other hand, conflict has become an evitable phenomenon in human existence. As long as there are social relationships between individuals and groups in the society, conflict will persist. Although, conflict often initiates change in society, its violent form is negative and reverses societal progress, promoting poverty and anarchy. There is n o doubt that violent conflict has wreaked havoc on our communal and national social fabrics since 1999, in particular, when electoral democracy was enthroned in Nigeria. Compounding the problem of underdevelopment in Nigeria is micro nationalism, ethnic, religious and communal conflicts which pose great threat to peace, security and progress. The crises had closed the doors of friendship, interaction and rapport among the various ethnic groups in the nation. Therefore, attempts at promoting peaceful co-existence among the various identities that exists in the nation becomes contradictory if not elusive as various ethnic, religious, political, economic and social catastrophe keep one reoccurring in the polity. This has compounded the situation of insecurity in Nigeria’s fragile federal system which, over the years, has experienced ethnic, religious and political crises of monumental proportions. The most devastating amongst these have been communal conflicts in all parts of the country. The frequent occurrence of conflict in Nigeria in recent times is a threat not only to democracy but also to the corporate existence of the country as a political entity. Since good governance is an essential ingredient in the promotion of peaceful coexistence in the society given its indispensable elements of rule of law, human right protection, free and fair election, accountability, independent court of law as well as creating the right environment for socio-economic development (AbdulMaleek 2011). Therefore, this work seeks to evaluate the relation between good governance and conflict occurrence with special reference to Aguleri and Umuleri conflict.

**1.2 Statement of the problem**

Governance, can be said to be the process of decision making and the process by which decisions are implemented or not implemented.however, when it comes to good governance It is participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive and follows the rule of law. It assures that corruption is minimized, the views of minorities are taken into account and that the voices of the most vulnerable in society are heard in decision making. It is also responsive to the present and future needs of society. Hence, the need for good governance in conflict management which came to play in the conflict between Aguleri and Umuleri communities over the ownership of Otuocha land in Anambra state.hence the need to discuss good governance and conflict management.

**1.3 Objective Of The Study**

The primary objective for the study is as follows

1. To examine what good governance is all about
2. To investigate conflict management practices
3. To find out the history of Aguleri and Umuleri conflict
4. To find out ways conflict can be avoided

**1.4 Research Questions**

1. What is good governance**?**
2. What are the ways by which conflict can be managed?
3. Are there causes to the Aguleri and Umuleri conflict?
4. Can conflict be avoided?

**1.5 Research Methodology**

The method of this research is qualitative method and our means of Data collection will be primary and secondary sources. This work will be discussed in five chapters which includes what good governance is all about. investigate conflict management practices. find out the history of Aguleri and Umuleri conflict. find out ways conflict can be avoided. Summary conclusions and recommendation.

**1.6 Significance Of The Study**

The significance of this study cannot be underestimated as:

* This study will examine good governance and conflict management.
* The findings of this research work will undoubtedly provide the much needed information to government organizations, security operatives, political leaders and academia.

**1.7 Scope Of The Study**

This study will examine good governance and conflict management. Hence will be delimited to conflict of land between Umuleri and Aguleri communities in Anambra State

**1.8 Limitation Of The Study**

This study was constrained by a number of factors which are as follows:

just like any other research, ranging from unavailability of needed accurate materials on the topic under study, inability to get data

Financial constraint , was faced by the researcher ,in getting relevant materials and in printing and collation of questionnaires

Time factor: time factor pose another constraint since having to shuttle between writing of the research and also engaging in other academic work making it uneasy for the researcher

**1.9 Operational Definition**

**Good governance:** a way of measuring how public institutions conduct public affairs and manage public resources in a preferred way.

**Conflict management:** **t**he process of limiting the negative aspects of conflict while increasing the positive aspects of conflict

**CHAPTER TWO**

**GOOD GOVERNANCE**

**2.1 GOVERNANCE**

The concept of "governance" is not new. It is as old as human civilization. Simply put "governance" means: the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented (or not implemented). Governance can be used in several contexts such as corporate governance, international governance, national governance and local governance. Since governance is the process of decision making and the process by which decisions are implemented, an analysis of governance focuses on the formal and informal actors involved in decision-making and implementing the decisions made and the formal and informal structures that have been set in place to arrive at and implement the decision. Government is one of the actors in governance. Other actors involved in governance vary depending on the level of government that is under discussion. In rural areas, for example, other actors may include influential land lords, associations of peasant farmers, cooperatives, NGOs, research institutes, religious leaders, finance institutions political parties, the military etc. The situation in urban areas is much more complex (Yap,2010). At the national level, in addition to the above actors, media, lobbyists, international donors, multi-national corporations, etc. may play a role in decisionmaking or in influencing the decision-making process. All actors other than government and the military are grouped together as part of the "civil society." In some countries in addition to the civil society, organized crime syndicates also influence decision-making, particularly in urban areas and at the national level. Similarly formal government structures are one means by which decisions are arrived at and implemented. At the national level, informal decision-making structures, such as "kitchen cabinets" or informal advisors may exist. In urban areas, organized crime syndicates such as the "land Mafia" may influence decision-making. In some rural areas locally powerful families may make or influence decision-making. Such, informal decision-making is often the result of corrupt practices or leads to corrupt practices(Yap,2010).

**2.2 Good Governance**

Good governance has 8 major characteristics. It is participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive and follows the rule of law. It assures that corruption is minimized, the views of minorities are taken into account and that the voices of the most vulnerable in society are heard in decision-making. It is also responsive to the present and future needs of society.

**2.3 Participation**

Participation by both men and women is a key cornerstone of good governance. Participation could be either direct or through legitimate intermediate institutions or representatives. It is important to point out that representative democracy does not necessarily mean that the concerns of the most vulnerable in society would be taken into consideration in decision making. Participation needs to be informed and organized. This means freedom of association and expression on the one hand and an organized civil society on the other hand (Yap,2010).

**2.4 Rule of law**

Good governance requires fair legal frameworks that are enforced impartially. It also requires full protection of human rights, particularly those of minorities. Impartial enforcement of laws requires an independent judiciary and an impartial and incorruptible police force.

**2.5 Transparency**

Transparency means that decisions taken and their enforcement are done in a manner that follows rules and regulations. It also means that information is freely available and directly accessible to those who will be affected by such decisions and their enforcement. It also means that enough information is provided and that it is provided in easily understandable forms and media

**2.6 Responsiveness**

Good governance requires that institutions and processes try to serve all stakeholders within a reasonable time frame.

**2.7 Consensus oriented**

There are several actors and as many view points in a given society. Good governance requires mediation of the different interests in society to reach a broad consensus in society on what is in the best interest of the whole community and how this can be achieved. It also requires a broad and long-term perspective on what is needed for sustainable human development and how to achieve the goals of such development. This can only result from an understanding of the historical, cultural and social contexts of a given society or community.

**2.8 Equity and inclusiveness**

A society’s well being depends on ensuring that all its members feel that they have a stake in it and do not feel excluded from the mainstream of society. This requires all groups, but particularly the most vulnerable, have opportunities to improve or maintain their well being.

**2.9 Effectiveness and efficiency**

Good governance means that processes and institutions produce results that meet the needs of society while making the best use of resources at their disposal. The concept of efficiency in the context of good governance also covers the sustainable use of natural resources and the protection of the environment.

**2.1.0 Accountability**

Accountability is a key requirement of good governance. Not only governmental institutions but also the private sector and civil society organizations must be accountable to the public and to their institutional stakeholders. Who is accountable to whom varies depending on whether decisions or actions taken are internal or external to an organization or institution. In general an organization or an institution is accountable to those who will be affected by its decisions or actions. Accountability cannot be enforced without transparency and the rule of law(Yap,2010).

**CHAPTER THREE**

**CONFLICT MANAGEMENT**

**3.1 CONFLICT**

As long as organizations continue to use work teams, conflict cannot be avoided since it is an inevitable aspect of work teams. Conflict is an outcome of behaviors. It is an integral part of human life. Whenever there is interaction there is conflict. Conflict means expression of hostility, negative attitudes, antagonism, aggression, rivalry, and misunderstanding. It is also associated with situations that involve contradictory interest between two opposing groups. It can be defined as a disagreement between two or more individuals or groups with each individual or group trying to gain acceptance of its view over others. Conflict has been studied over centuries by many great minds. But a more systematic study has been possible only since the twentieth century (Schellenberg 1996). With the emergence of political anthropology as a special branch of social anthropology, marked by the publication of "African Political Systems" (1940), edited by Fortes and Evans-Pritchard, that the study of conflict resolution became prominent. However, theoretical controversies over the subject of conflict and its resolution have survived a long history of the study. From the very outset, scholars do not agree upon whether conflict is a disjunctive process or socialization. Some scholars have contended that conflict has a divisive effect. For instance, Durkheim (cited in Sipova, 1989) considered conflict as an abnormal phenomenon. He used the term anomie or pathology to describe it. Similarly, Wilson and Kolb (1949, cited in Colser, 1964) believed that conflict has a disjunctive effect. Many other scholars have repudiated this view. Park and Burgess (1921) and Simmel (1955), cited in Colser (1964) argue that every interaction among men is a sociation, so is conflict. Conflict is a means to solve and avert complete fission, thereby preserve some kind of unity. Similarly, Bohannan (1967:) characterizes conflict to be as basic as culture is in society, which possibly controlled and utilized profitably for better cultural development and maintenance of social order. Schellenberg (1996) states that conflict is neither bad nor good, but one of the essentials in human social life. Gluckman (1956), Gulliver (1963) and Nanda (1994) agree with the view that conflict is a part of social life and society is impossible without it. Further, Marxian view conflict not only as built into the social system but also as the primary stimulus for social change (Seymour-Smith, 1986: 51). Robbins (2005) has defined as ―a process that begins where one party perceives that another party has negatively affected, or is about to negatively affects something that the first party cares about‖. This is a very apt definition emphasising that conflcit is about perception not necessarily real hard facts. It points to the emotional nature of conflict, by referring to a word like ―care‖. It states that more than one party is involved and that there may be future component attached to it. Conflict means to be in opposition to one another. It refers to disagreement between people or members of organisations. Such disagreement is inherent in relationships between all human beings. Larfela (1988) concurs with this view when he defines conflict as: "Part of the competition process that is basic to the survival and successful evolution of the species, homosapiens and to his search for new and better ways to cope with limited resources and stress from environmental change." According to this definition it is obvious that conflict always exists between people, groups of people, members of an organisation and between organisations which are related in one way or another. Organizational conflict is defined as the behaviour intended to obstruct the achievement of some other person’s goals. Conflict is therefore a product of incompatibility of goals and it arises from opposing behaviours. According to Lewis, French and Steane (1997), conflict within an organisation is inevitable. This is a consequence of boundaries arising within any organisational structure, creating separate groups that need to compete for scarce resources. Rivers (2005) published research that suggested that the mere fact of categoristion (between us and them) is enough to cause conflict. They term this the social identity theory. This categorisation is exactly what happens when groups are formed; representing different functions wihin an organisation and it support the notion that is inevitable. (Lewis, 1997). Appelbaum, Abdallah and Shapiro (1999) further builds on this by stating that conflict is a process of social interaction. It involves a struggle over claims to resources, power and status, beliefs, preferences and desires. Darling and Walker (2001) link this idea to the organisation by stating that, even when conflict is a natural phenomenon in social relations, it can nevertheless be managed within companies.

**3.2 Transition in views of Conflict**:

**Traditional School View of Conflict:**

This school views conflicts as bad for organizations because it is disruptive, unnatural and represents a form of deviant behaviour which, should be controlled and changed if the objectives of the organization is to be achieved. To the traditional school, conflict situations can have tragic consequences for some people and adverse effect on organizational performance. Both the scientific management approach and the administrative school of management relied heavily on developing such organizational structures that would specify tasks, rules, regulations, procedures and authority relationships so that if a conflict develops than these built in rules and regulations would identify and correct problems of conflict. General view was that conflict indicates a malfunction with in a group and must be avoided. This view proposed that very little value ever stemmed from conflict Robbins (2005) called this the traditional view. 

**Human Relation school view of Conflict:**

According to this similar theory that conflict is avoidable by creating an environment of goodwill and trust. Management has always been concerned with avoiding conflict if possible and resolving it soon if it occurs. 

**The Inter actionist school view of Conflict:**

Townsend (1985) sees conflict as a sign of a healthy organization up to a point. A good manager according to him, does not try to eliminate conflict, he tries to keep it from wasting the energies of his people... if you are the boss and your people fight you openly when they think you are wrong, that’s healthy. If your people fight each other openly in your presence for what they believed in - that’s healthy. But keep all the conflict eyeball to eyeball. Robins (1998) believes that conflict is a positive force and necessary for effective performance. This approach encourages a minimum level of conflict within the group in order to encourage self-criticism, change and innovation and to help prevent apathy or too great a tolerance for harmony and the status quo. Conflict is an inevitable feature of organizational life and should be judged by its on performance. 

**Integrationist school view of Conflict:**

This is the most recent perspective and explicitly argues that some conflict should not only be seen as good or bad but rather that some conflict is absolutely necessary for a group to perform effectively (De Dreu & Van de Vliert, 1997).

**3.3 Forms of Conflict in Organization:**

Conflict can take on any several different forms in an organisation, including interpersonal, intrapersonal, intergroup, intergroup and interorganisational conflicts. It is important to note that the prefix inter means between‖ whereas the prefix intra means within‖. 

**Interpersonal Conflict:**

Interpersonal conflict emphasizes the interaction of human factors in an organization. Here we are concerned with these factors as they appear in a dyadic relationship. Conflict between people can arise from many individual differences, including personalities, attitude, values, perceptions and other differences. It may be substantive or emotional or both. Two persons debating each other aggressively on the merits of hiring a job applicant is an example of a substantive interpersonal conflict. Two persons continually in disagreement over each other’s choice of work attire is an example of an emotional interpersonal conflict.

**Intra-personal Conflict:**

Intrapersonal conflict is internal to the individual (though its effects can profoundly influence organizational functioning) and is perhaps the most difficult form of conflict to analyze and manage.Intrapersonal conflict is basically a conflict between two incompatible tendencies. It arises when a stimulus evokes two different and incompatible tendencies and the individual is required to discriminate between these tendencies. In such a situation it is common for individuals to experience frustrations and to allow their conflict situation to be expressed in a range of behaviour strategies ranging from apathy and boredom to absenteeism, excessive drinking or destructive behaviour. If such behavioral consequences are to be avoided, then it is essential to diagnose individual perception and utilize some techniques that would reduce anxiety-eliciting stimuli and increase consonance between individual behaviour and organizational requirements.

Intrapersonal conflicts often involve actual or perceived pressures from incompatible goals or expectations of the following types: Approach–approach conflict occurs when a person must choose between two positive and equally attractive alternatives. An example has to choose between a valued promotion in the organization or a desirable new job with another firm. Avoidance–avoidance conflict occurs when a person must choose between two negative and equally unattractive alternatives. An example is being asked either to accept a job transfer to another town in an undesirable location or to have one’s employment with an organization terminated. Approach–avoidance conflict occurs when a person must decide to do something that has both positive and negative consequences. An example is being offered a higher paying job whose responsibilities entail unwanted demands on one’s personal time.

**Intergroup conflict:**

Interfroup conflict occurs among members of different teams or groups can also have substantive and/or emotional underpinnings. Intergroup conflict is quite common in organizations, and it can make the coordination and integration of task activities very difficult. The classic example is conflict among functional groups or departments, such as marketing and manufacturing, in organizations. The growing use of crossfunctional teams and task forces is one way of trying to minimize such conflicts and promote more creative and efficient operations.

**Intragroup Conflict:**

Conflict that occurs within groups or teams is called intra-group conflict. There are two types of intra-group conflict: Task conflict and Relationship conflict. Task conflict is a perception of disagreement group members or individuals about the content of their decisions and involves differences in viewpoints, ideas and opinions. For example task conflict about the distribution of resources, about procedures or guidelines and about the interpretation of facts. Relationship conflict is a perception of interpersonal incompatibility and includes annoyance and animosity among individuals.

**Inter - organizational Conflict:**

Conflict that occurs between two or more organization is called inter organisational conflict. Competition can heighten inter organisational conflict. Corporate take over’s, mergers and acquisition can also produce inter organisational conflict. Ikeda observed that organizational conflict involves interpersonal conflicts with colleagues or supervisors, or inter group conflicts within different sections of an organization. There are two essential types of conflict in organizations: vertical and horizontal. Vertical conflict occurs in groups of different hierarchical levels, such as supervisors and salesmen, whereas horizontal conflict occurs between individuals of the same level, such as managers in the same organization. In the vertical conflict, differences in status and power between groups are in general larger than in the horizontal conflict because these aspects tend to equalize in equivalent hierarchical levels. When vertical conflict takes place between operational workers and administration, their sources refer to: (i) psychological distance: workers don’t feel involved in the organization and feel that their needs are not met; (ii) power and status: workers feel powerless and alienated; (iii) differences in value and ideology: this difference represents underlying beliefs on objectives and goals of an organization and; (iv) scarce resources: disagreements regarding benefits, salary and work conditions. In vertical conflict, apparently individuals in lower organizational level seek to avoid conflicts with higher hierarchical levels. Pondy observed that it is expected that the top management peers perceive more conflict internally between their groups than those of lower position. This happens because of the following:reasons: (i) people in higher hierarchical level, rather than the lower ones, are engaged in non-routine activities and development of politics, where orientation for the actions are less clear and chances for disagreement, bigger and; (ii) people in higher hierarchical level, rather than the lower ones, are probably less flexible in their points of view. Hence conflict resolution is more difficult. Considering the vertical conflict, research examines the short-term and long-term effects of perceived fairness in organizational conflicts between employees and supervisors. Employee’s fairness is important in the resolution of organizational conflicts. When employees realize that there was fairness in the conflict resolution, the bond between the groups strengthens. Perceived and distributive fairness significantly enhances job satisfaction, positive organizational commitment and satisfaction with outcome of conflicts.

**3.4 Sources of Conflict**

Throughout the history of the study of conflict, whether the aggressive behavior is an inborn human quality or a reaction to social, political and economic factors is where lay the controversy among the scholars (Nader, 1968, Collier, 1975, Tadesse, 1988, 1994). Some scholars have agreed that the causes of conflict are deep rooted in our biology. Schellernberg (1996) describes such an approach as individual characteristic theory that focuses on the individual and his acts, rather than the context of the act. This view of conflict has its root in the work of Freud, who believed that violence is rooted in our basic nature as animals. Human conflict is inevitable not because it is part of social life, but for it is a biological fact lying within us all. Later writers have used Freud's assertion, too. Nineteenth century social Darwinists stressed the role of competition and conflict in all human societies. Taking the idea of the survival of the fittest‖ as a basis, they analyzed conflict as part of a universal struggle urged by inborn aggressive tendencies. The new theoretical perspective under the name of ethnology also supports Fereud’s view. This approach, according to Schellenberg (1996) emphasizes the genetic instance of social behaviors. Ardrey (1961, 1966) and Lorenz (1963, 1966) cited in Tadesse (1988) and McCauley (1990), who argue and popularize that human violent behavior is inherited, were representatives of this approach. Tadesse (1988) further illustrated that a given society or individual persons could be peaceful and/or violent across time and circumstances. Anthropologists have effectively used these ethnographic works to refute the biologically based explanation of the sources of conflict and show its inadequacy. Even those who have challenged the innate nature of human aggression have taken different paths to treat the sources of conflict. Whether or not material ends are the final causes is another point of debate. According to Roberchek (1990), ecological functionalists (for instance, Harris, 1972, Gross, 1975, Ross, 1978, Ferguson, 1984) assert that material causes are the final arbiter of human behavior. Opposing this view, Gibson (1990) argues that the materialistic and deterministic final cause argument is inadequate to explain the causal dynamics of particular conflicts. It is unable to link material cause with cultural elements, and it leaves no room for consideration of human decision-making. Katz identifies three sources of conflict. These are: (1) structural conflict (conflict arising out of the need to manage the interdependence between different organizational sub-units), (2) role conflict (conflict arising from sets of prescribed behaviour) and (3) resources conflict (conflict stemming from interest groups competing for organizational resources). Robbins identifies three sources of organizational conflict and indicates that an understanding of the source of a conflict improves the probability of effective conflict management. The main factors which serve as sources of conflict are identified as (1) communicational (conflicts arising from misunderstandings etc.), (2) structural (conflicts related to organizational roles), and (3) personal (conflicts stemming from individual differences). Methods of conflict management which are appropriate in one case may not necessarily be appropriate when applied to a conflict qenerated from another source. Different perspective which traces the source of organizational conflict to the unit of analysis involved. Units of analysis are the parties to a conflict. They perceive, initiate and sustain a conflict. Their characteristics specify the conditions which affect the course of a conflict and determine the mode of its management. Thus, we have conflicts that originate in the individual person, conflicts that have their basis in the relationship between individuals, and conflicts that occur as a result of interactions between groups. In such a situation it is common for individuals to experience frustrations and to allow their conflict situation to be expressed in a range of behavioural strategies ranging from apathy and boredom to absenteeism, excessive drinking or destructive behaviour. Jung declares that conflict is clearly associated with power and can emerge when goal achievement of an organization is avoided. It is also believed that people are aware of the factors that generate conflicts such as scarcity, obstruction and incompatible interests or goals. Conflict can also be broken out when one party avoids the goal achievement of the other one. However, opined that it is probable that causes for conflicts are not highly correlated with goal and objective achievement in situations of routine behavior where procedures are well defined and environment is stable. In these circumstances, conflict variables are probably more related to personality, autonomy reasons, functional interdependence and status. Some of the reasons that justify conflict escalation according to Ikeda AA, Veludo-de-Oliveira, Campomar MC, 2005are: (i) as departments grow, people lose contact with other departments, or yet, members of a department start to think differently from other areas; (ii) the increase of emphasis in the financial measures as a tool for motivation for managers and the establishment of different profit centers inside an integrated business system end up creating many conflicts; (iii) the increasing rise of emphasis in functional specialization, politics of promotion and recruiting reinforce the isolation of departments, generating conflicts; (iv) today there is more room for workers to show criticism among each other, while this freedom of speech can be beneficial for society as a whole, in organizational context can be transformed into conflicts and (v) consumers demand lower prices, better quality in products and services, creating pressures so that departments work more effectively which can result in conflicts among departments. Another reason pointed by Kumar N, Scheer L, Steenkamp J, 1995 for the occurrence of conflicts is the asymmetric degree of interdependence that affects the level of trust and commitment of the groups. Asymmetric interdependence occurs when parties have different levels of dependence among each other. That is, in one same group some individuals can depend on people that, in turn, show independence in relation to them. In total interdependence, on the other hand, individuals are totally dependent on one another. Kumar et al states those relationships with total interdependence have less conflict than the ones with asymmetric interdependence. For, conflict is smaller in highly dependent relationships because, in general, the dependent party conforms itself that it can not alter the situation and accepts the leader’s power. According to Capozzoli (1995) there are seven causes of conflict: (1) Team members bring culturally diverse values to their work teams. (2) Team members have different attitudes that result in different goals for team members.(3) Team members have different needs that are not met, which result in frustration that exacerbrates conflict. (4) Various expectations of the team members are not met and result in conflict. (5) Team members have different perceptions that result in differing interpretations of the same information. (6) Limited reources often result in an increase in conflict. (7) Team members have different personalities that clash with each other. (Rayeski and Bryant (1994) also suggest that conflict is driven by ppressure and confusion creates stressful situations for the team and its members. In addition Kezsbom (1992) did a study and identified conflict sources including: goal and priority definition, personality, communication (see also Twnsley 1997) politics, administrative procedures, resource allocations, scheduling, leadership, ambiguous roles/structure, costs, reward structure, technical opinions, and unresolved prior conflicts. This study showed the importance of how certain conflict sources compared to other conflict sources. In any organization, there are many causes of conflicts; however, conflicts within an individual usually arise when a person is uncertain about what task is expected to do, if not clearly defined by the supervisor or the person in charge. Furthermore, if the tasks of individuals working as a group are not clearly defined by the management they will lead to more conflicts. Conflicts between individuals may result from role-related pressures. Conflicts would arise between individuals and groups if the goals were not specified for individuals within a group. Additionally, according to the literature, there are innumerable origins of organizational dispute and each produces its own variety of effects. In general, there are six major sources: (i) the interpersonal disagreements that arise when one person is experiencing individual stress; (ii) the problems resulting from role conflict, a condition that occurs when there is a clash over one's role in the organization; (iii) the power struggles that pit persons and groups against one another to achieve their own selfish objectives; (iv) the misunderstandings and disagreements from differentiation, i.e., the clashes that arise because people approach common problems from very different orientations; (v) the interdependence requirements for collaboration which, if not extensive and balanced between the parties, cause communication and interaction breakdowns which, in turn, if critical, lead to more intensive conflicts; and (vi) the external pressures from forces outside the enterprise that breed internal pressures as the system seeks to adapt but not to disrupt its internal order.

**3.5 Managing Conflict**

Anderson (1990) and Burton (1987) maintain that conflict management has a wide application. Burton (I987) goes on to state that the significant feature of conflict management is that it is an attempt by the status quo to manage the dispute, or to avoid escalation of the conflict. Conflict resolution refers to dealing with or removing the cause of the conflict In this paper conflict management will refer to both strategies and approaches of containing (managing the conflict) as well as to strategies and approaches of resolving it. Ways of managing organizational conflict are as varied as its causes, origins and contexts. The purpose of conflict management, whether undertaken by the parties in conflict or whether involving the intervention of an outside party, is to affect the entire structure of a conflict situation so as to contain the destructive components in the conflict process (e.g. hostility, use of violence) and help the parties possessing incompatible goals to find some solution to their conflict. Effective conflict management succeeds in (1) minimizing disruption stemming from the existence of a conflict, and (2) providing a solution that is satisfactory and acceptable. All organizations, however simple or complex, possess a range of mechanisms or procedures for managing conflict. The success or effectiveness of such procedures can be gauged by the extent to which they limit conflict behaviour and the extent to which they help to achieve a satisfactory solution.Different people use different strategies for managing conflict. Usually we are not aware of how we act in conflict situations. We just do whatever seems to come naturally. But we do have a personal strategy; and because it is learned, we can always change it by learning new and more ef-fective ways of managing conflicts. When you become engaged in a conflict, there are two major concerns individuals have to take into account:

**Achieving your personal goals** —

Individuals are in conflict because individuals have a goal that conflicts with another person’s goal. Individual goal may be of high importance to him, or it may be of little importance to him.

**Keeping a good relationship with the other person**

Individuals may need to be able to interact effectively with the other person in the future. The relationship may be very important to individual or may be of little importance to him. How important your personal goals are to you and how important the relationship is to you affects how you act in a conflict. Given these two concerns, it is possible to identify styles of managing conflict in an organization are as follows

**3.6 styles of managing conflict**

**Avoiding:**

The basic goal of the avoidance it to delay. Person would rather hide and ignore conflict than resolve it. This leads to the uncooperative and unassertive. Person tend to give up personal goals and display passive behavior creating lose-lose situations. Person believes it is easier to withdraw from a conflict rather than to face it. Avoiding strategy may help to maintain relationship that would be hurt by conflict resolution and very effective way to affront conflictive situations at short term. Disadvantage may be conflict remain unresolved, overuse of the style leads to others walking all over them. Appropriate time to use this style when stakes are not high or issues is trivial, when confrontation will hurt a working relationship, when there is little chance of satisfying your wants, when disruption outweighs the benefit of conflict resolution, when gathering information is more important than an immediate decision, when others can more effectively resolve the conflict and when time constraints demand a delay.

**Smoothing:**

Smoothing refers to the conciliation that occurs when one person or group is willing to yield to the other. Smoothing results from a low concern for ones group own interests combined with a high concern for the interest of other group. Smoothing conflict management style emphasis on human relationships. Individuals ignore their own goals and resolve conflict by giving in to others because they see the relationships as of the greatest importance while their own goals are of the least importance. Individuals smooth over the conflict out of fear of harming the relationship—their unassertive and cooperative behavior creates a win/lose situation want to be accepted and liked by others. Individuals think that conflict should be avoided in favor of harmony and that people cannot discuss conflicts without damaging relationships. Individuals are afraid that if the conflict continues, someone will get hurt and that would ruin the relation-ship. Advantage of Smoothing style is to maintain relationship but giving in may not be productive. Appropriate time to use this style is when maintaining the relationship outweighs other considerations, when suggestions/changes are not important to the accommodator, when time is limited or when harmony and stability are valued.

**Forcing:**

It designates a situation in which one person or group attempts to acquire complete dominance. Individual do not hesitate to use aggressive behaviour to resolve conflict. Individual assume that conflict is settled by one person winning and one person losing and they want to be the winner and creating a win-lose situation. Winning gives a sense of pride and achievement. Losing gives a individual a sense of weakness, inadequacy or failure. If individual decision is correct a better decision without compromise can result. If individual decision is incorrect may bred hostility and resentment toward the person using it. This style is appropriate when quick decisive action is vital; on important issues where unpopular actions need implementing example. Cost cutting,

**Confronting:**

Confronting style refers to strong cooperative and assertive behaviour. It is the win-win approach to interpersonal conflict handling. The person using confronting desire to maximize joint results. An individual who uses this style tends to see conflict as natural, helpful, and leading to a more creative solution if handled properly. Exhibit trust in others and conflict is resolve to the satisfaction of all. Confronting style is most practical to find an integrative solution when both sets of concerns are too important to be compromised, when objective is to learn, to gain commitment by incorporating concerns into a consensus and to work through feelings that have inferred with a relationship.

**3.7 Role of Bargaining and negotiations in resolving conflict:**

It is impossible to avoid conflict in organisation therefore it is require to manage conflict so it become constructive and functional. Through bargaining and negotiations strategic conflict can be managed. The process of negotiation involves an open discussion of problem solutions and the outcome often is an exchange in which both parties work toward a mutually beneficial solutions. There are five basic bargaining style are Conflict avoider, Accommodator, Compromiser, Problem solver and Competitor. Interactive communication depends on which bargaining style adopted by both the parties involved in conflict. Harvard negotiation project explained difference between three types of bargaining strategy:There are two major approaches of Bargaining: distributive bargaining and integrative bargaining. Distributive bargaining is an approach in which the goals of one party are in direct conflict with the goals of other party. It is a competitive or win lose approach to negotiations. Integrative bargaining is an approach in which the parties focus on making possible to achieve their objectives. Integrative negotiation focuses on the merit of the issues and is a win-win approach. Both parties hold positive attitude, understand the needs of one another and focuses to establish long term relationship.

**3.8 The Role of Third parties in resolving conflict**

**Mediator:**

Mediation is the most common form of conflict resolution. It involves an independent, impartial person helping two individuals or groups reach a solution that is acceptable to everyone. Mediation is not prescriptive. It helps the parties involved to make progress in resolving their differences. It does not make judgments or determine outcomes. Mediators do not have any formal authority. Success of mediation depends on both parties level of trust on mediator.

**Arbitrator:**

Arbitrator can employ any techniques or strategies used by a mediator. Arbitrator has option of dictating the solution o the conflict.

**Conciliation and Consultation:**

Rather than mediating or arbitrating the third party can provide conciliation (James, 1987; Robinson & Parkinsion, 1985; Webb 1986) or consultation (Fisher). These both are less formal than mediation or arbitration and are more voluntary. There is evidence that consultation (Fisher, 1990) and conciliation (Blain, Goodman, Lowenberg, 1987; Trip, 1985) do help to manage conflict. Because of their non assertive nature.

**CHAPTER FOUR**

**HISTORY OF UMULERI AND AGULERI CONFLICT**

**4.1 HISTORICAL ORIGIN OF UMULERI AND AGULERI**

The historical origin of Aguleri and Umuleri communities is a central factor in the conflicts between the duo. This, paradoxically, formed a divisive factor rather than a unifying factor. It is an established fact that the two communities are in conflict over who among them is the rightful and direct descendant of Eri. This is because the direct descendants should be in a rightful position to lay claim to the ownership of the land in contest. Although, neither of the two communities ever denied each other of the claim of Eri The Umuleri community claim the headship of the Eri clan, and this explains the reason behind their changing their name in the recent past from Umuleri to ‘Umueri’, meaning the children of Eri. According to an account of Eri genealogy, as advanced by Umuleri people, Eri was a warrior, hunter, and polygamist, who married many wives, among whom was Iguedo. The union between Iguedo and Eri gave birth to Ogbunike, Awkuzu, Umuleri and Nando, (Interview with Ike Manafa). This, the Aguleri people strongly oppose. Another view, as advanced by Aguleri people, has it that Umuleri are descendants of Ulu Eri, the first fruit of an affair between Iguedo, the pretty daughter of Agulu, the first son of Eri, and Okebo, a trader from Arochukwu, (Interview with Ike Manafa). Consequently, Umuleri people appear, from this account, to be the children

of Ulu Eri (*Umu ulu Eri*), and their claim to the direct descent of Eri raises a big question, and thus call for further study to ascertain the authenticity of the claims. The name Aguleri (Agulu Eri) which seem to have been derived from the name of the first son of Eri, “the evidence of Eri’s grave at Okpu Ivite Aguleri, the annual memorial feast of Eri (*Oriri obibia Eri*)” and the existence of *OBU* GAD (The palace of Gad, the father of Eri), seem to authenticate the claim by Aguleri community of being the direct descendant of Eri. There is also a tradition which subsist till date, where an Eze Nri (the Traditional Ruler of Nri, a community in the present Anaocha Local Government Area of Anambra State, which occupy a place of prominence in Igboland), before coronation and installation, is required to perform some rites, after which he receives the staff of office from Eze Aguleri (Interview with Eze Chukwuemeka Eri). This tradition seem to give credence to Aguleri claim of Eri patriarchy.

**4.2 NATURE AND CAUSE OF UMULERI AND AGULERI CONFLICT**

The conflict that engulfed Aguleri and Umuleri communities over the ownership and control of Otuocha is multifaceted. This is because the sister communities exploited

various means, which included litigations, wars and every other means deployed to claim the exclusive ownership and control of Otuocha. The commoditization of land with the

advent of colonial rule encouraged competition over the control of lease to Europeans in Otuocha. This competition always brewed animosity which led to the escalation of the

conflicts by the newer generations, who do not even know the genesis of the conflicts, but engage in them just because their ancestors did. This situation made the conflicts almost insoluble. The struggle over the ownership of Otuocha land took the Aguleri and Umuleri communities through litigations in courts of competent jurisdiction, both within and outside the shores of Nigeria. Court actions were instituted by the two communities in the Native Courts, West African Court of Appeal (WACA), and the Privy Council in London. After Nigeria’s Independence in 1960, the cases were also adjudicated on at the Onitsha and Otuocha High Courts respectively, the Federal Court of Appeal, and terminated at the Supreme Court of Nigeria in 1984. The first court action instituted over the Otuocha land was in 1920 at the instance of the Umuleri community. According to Eze R.A. Idigo, “the court action was sequel to the expulsion of the people of Umuleri by the Aguleri people from Omambala beach in 1920”. The dispute over Otuocha arose again in 1932. This was because the Anam people drove the Umuleri people away from their lands (Interview Ejinna Iveacho). The litigations instituted by the two communities

were entertained and Rulings/Judgements entered in favour and against both at one time or another. These court judgements in no mean way increased the tempo of the conflict, because these communities based on these judgments, continued to lay claim to the ownership of Otuocha land. The legal tussle over Otuocha land reached its peak in

1982. The Umuleri community, not satisfied with the ruling of the Court of Appeal in Enugu, filed an appeal at the Supreme Court in Lagos. The five man panel, headed by Justice Ayo Irikefe, allowed the appeal of the appellants (Umuleri) by restoring the judgment of the Onitsha High Court. The High Court affirmed that Otuocha was an unoccupied piece of land that laid fallow, and that the Umuleri were the first to settle

there in the 19th century. The court still failed to grant the right of exclusive ownership to Umuleri. The Supreme Court faulted the judgment of Justice Belgore on the grounds that it never found any proof of effective ownership on which it relied upon to adjudicate the matter in favour of Aguleri, except their recent settlement which was a recent development (Chinwuba:32). The claim of exclusive ownership, and struggle for outright possession of the Otuocha land by the people of Aguleri and Umuleri communities also took a devastating dimension of physical warfare. The year 1933 marked the beginning of a new era in the claims and counter claims over Otuocha. This was because the two communities went to war for the first time in contest for Otuocha and Aguako lands.

Although the 1933 conflict lasted for only one day, yet it made a mark in Aguleri-Umuleri relationship. This marked the genesis of strained relations between the two sister

communities. The immediate cause of the war was the trespass into Otuocha land by some Umuleri indigenes to erect trading stalls without proper approval from their Aguleri

landlords30. The rent accruable to the indigenous people from lease of lands by European traders led to the emergence of ownership crisis which was non-existent before the European incursion into the *Omambala* River beach. The development brewed animosity and hatred between the two communities. In a bid to establish their right of exclusive ownership, the Umuleri community instituted a court action against the Aguleri community in the colonial court (Interview with Ike Manafa). The 1933 conflict was prosecuted with crude weapons which included machetes, clubs and cudgels among

others. Few people sustained injuries and no death was recorded. This could be attributed to the fact that colonial security agents intervened on time to put the conflict to a stop

(Chinwuba: 32). The attempt by the Anambra County Council to change the name of the disputed land from Otuocha to Otuocha-Aguleri incited another legal tussle which culminated in a war in 1964. The decision of the Privy Council London on the Otuocha land matter gave the Aguleri community the impression that they had won the case and that the disputed territory belonged to them. It was alleged that one Chief Hon. Paul Ndigwe, a member of the Eastern Nigeria House of Assembly, and Chief Barr. R.A Chinwuba, the secretary of Aguleri Youths Association (AYA) influenced the Minister

for Local Government and Chieftaincy Affairs of the former Eastern region, Chief John U. Nwodo to obtain the Official Gazette (ENLG.138 of 1964) containing the change from

Otuocha to Otuocha-Aguleri (Chinwuba, 1981). The Umuleri comunity, embittered by the publication, challenged the action of the honourable minister at the Onitsha High Court in suit No.0/2/65. Civil war broke out, but Umuleri got reprieve when the Colonel Chukwuemeka Ojukwu's government withdrew the said publication. While the Gazette was in force, both communities were battle ready so much that the slightest provocation was enough for the communities to explode. It was only the appearance of *Ada* masquerade of Umuleri on the 27th of December, 1964 that triggered off the war of 1964 (Interview with Austin Okeke aka “Igwe”). The Aguleri people alleged that the masquerade was on rampage and destroyed the property of Aguleri people. In order to control the ‘excesses’ of the said masquerade that appears annually, conflict ensued between the two already tensed communities. The conflict was fought with improved weaponry from what obtained in the 1933 war. Dane guns, flint-lock guns, cap guns, bows and arrows, machets and cudgels were used in the war that lasted for few days. This led to loss of lives and property. This development further worsened the relationship between Aguleri and Umuleri communities. It is pertinent to state that ego and pride had in no mean way influenced the outbreak of war in Otuocha, although the main cause of the conflict in the Otuocha area was the tussle for ownership and control of Otuocha, but hatred, jealousy and suspicion which characterize the Aguleri-Umuleri relations had its own role in the conflicts. The 1984 Supreme Court judgment would have

ordinarily buried the Aguleri and Umuleri conflicts over Otuocha. This was not to be, as the two communities resorted once again to war over the land. The immediate cause of

September, 1995 conflict was the allegations and counterallegations of trespass at the Agu Akor land. It was alleged that Chief Basil Orakwue of Ogbu, Umuleri sited his block

industry at the Umuanezunu-Aguleri family land at Agu-Akor. The said land is exactly within the *Owakalia Eze Obili,* the Agu Akor Royal groove and beach, where the family (Umuanezunu) worship the ruling spirit of luck (Interview with Ike Manafa). This matter was still being investigated by the police when another Umuleri man, Ogbuevi Dan Ekwevi, also known as *‘Okwu Oto Ekene Eze’* began to build his Petrol Station at another portion of the Agu Akor. On questioning by the Aguleri people, he claimed to have bought the said portion of land from one Ikeli, who migrated from Aguleri and settled in Umuleri, where he was practicing his profession. The said Ikeli claimed to have also bought the land from an undisclosed family in Aguleri. The Aguleri community thus issued a 'stop work' order. This order was not obeyed, and on enquiry by one Chief Hon. Taiko Nwata, a prominent Aguleri man to ascertain why the workers at the site flouted the community 'stop work' order, he was beaten up and murdered. This attracted the attention of people at Ama Umuala, Eziagulu Aguleri, who raised alarm and alerted the police. This development drew the ire of the already provoked Aguleri youths, who without waiting for the report of the police investigation, took up arms against their Umuleri counterparts. The war of September, 1995 was an entirely different scenario from what obtained in the history of intercommunal wars in the neighbourhood. Sophisticated weapons were deployed to the battle field. The questions here were, when were these weapons procured? For what purpose? who

procured them? The answers to these questions would go a long way in providing the real reasons for the undeserving war. The crises lasted from 30th September through 6th

October, 1995 and was halted through the intervention of the then Military Administrator of Anambra State, Colonel Mike Attah; and the Assistant Inspector General of Police (AIG) Benin zone, Alhaji Kumasi (Newswatch, 1999:16). A ThreeMan Commission of Inquiry was constituted to probe the causes of the war on the 25th day of October 1995 by the Military Administrator of the State. Members of the commission were Hon. Justice Moses O. Nweje (Rtd), Chairman, Chief B.C. Odenigbo, and Mr. S.S.C Oguagha as

members. The Commission of Inquiry completed its assignment and submitted its report to the Government. The Government in turn, released the findings of the Commission

in February, 1997. The recommendations of the commission inter alia included;

i. that government should endeavour to reduce to the barest minimum, the area of contact and friction, between Aguleri and Umuleri; and

ii. in addition to the urbanization of Otuocha already effected by the designation of the urban areas order-1995, the boundary between Aguleri should be demarcated with large "streaming" beacons.

In an apparent retaliation for the 1995 war allegedly provoked by Aguleri, the government's lackadaisical attitude and the ever-growing animosity between the two belligerent communities went into the 1999 war which seem to be the ‘War of Wars', The government's lackadaisical attitude hinged on her abandoning the implementation of the white paper of the Justice Nweje Judicial Commission of Inquiry. This situation failed to address the issues raised, thereby opening up more avenues for attacks on both sides. The belligerents were freely grooming youths for war without any hindrance from the government. The death of Chief Hon. Mike E. Edozie, the then Chairman of Anambra East Local Government Area during the 1995 war was the major incident that triggered off the 1999 war of wars. Chief Edozie, incidentally had fraternal relations with the belligerents, in the sense that his paternal and maternal homes were Aguleri and Umuleri respectively, was accused by the Umuleri of taking sides with his paternal home, Aguleri, in the conflict. The plans by Aguleri community, to give their son, Chief Edozie, a befitting burial in recognition of his role in the affairs of Aguleri community allegedly infuriated the Umuleri community. There was also anger on the part of Umuleri on why Aguieri would want to celebrate the former chairman who was indicted in the report of the Judicial Commission of Inquiry and, who was supposed to be neutral in the matter owing to his official position and family background. There were rumours, threats and counter-threats which created a tense and crisis prone environment in the Otuocha area. The failure of the government of Wing Commander Emmanuel Ukaegbu to give prompt attention to security threats, security breaches, that emanated from the Otuocha area, and the implementation of the white paper of the judicial commission set up by his predecessor, Colonel Mike Attah escalated the conflict. The belligerents at this time were busy raising army and procuring arms and ammunition in preparation for a looming war. On the 3rd day of April 1999, during the burial ceremony of Chief Mike Edozie, some armed youths allegedly swooped on the mourners at the venue of the funeral ceremony 50. Pandemonium ensued as the youths allegedly dispersed mourners, shot at the crowd and killed many people, which included Emmanuel Isidienu and Ejike Mokwe, who an unprovoked attack on them by Umuleri", deployed every weapon in their arsenal to prosecute the war. were among the leaders of the Aguleri youths. War broke out immediately. The magnitude of the war between Aguleri and Umuleri in 1999 has never been witnessed within the South Eastern region in the post-civil war Nigeria (Ekeh, 2011). The 1999 war was a violent departure from what obtained in the previous conflicts fought by the belligerents. In the past conflicts, fighting was sporadic and short-lived and with few or no deaths or destruction of property. They were characterized by threats and counter-threats of exterminating one another. The 1999 war provided the opportunity for them to test their strength as well as execute their threats of exterminating each other. It does appear, Umuleri community, apprehensive of the rumour going round decided to be on the offensive by striking first, and Aguleri claiming that "this was an unprovoked attack on them by Umuleri", deployed every weapon in their arsenal to prosecute the war.

**CHAPTER FIVE**

**SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

**5.1 SUMMARY**

In this study, our focus was to examine good governance and conflict management using the conflict between Umuleri and Aguleri communities as a case study**.** The study specifically was aimed at highlighting what good governance is all about. Conflict management practice. History of Aguleri and Umuleri conflict.

**5.2 CONCLUSION**

Based on the finding of this study, the following conclusions were made:

1. Good governance is about how responsive leaders can be to the present and future needs of society.
2. good governance promotes peace in Nigeria policy and can be achieved through a transparency and accountability, Respect for the rule of law, Prudent management of resources, strict adherence to the principle of federal character in appointments.
3. The conflict between Aguleri and Umuleri communities over the ownership of Otuocha has continued to rear its ugly head from generation to generation, but every generation manages the conflict as it affects them.

**5.3 RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the responses obtained, the researcher proffers the following recommendations:

1. That Anambra state government should intervene in the conflict between the two communities in other to avoid further clash between the two communities
2. The two communities should find a breeding space to settle their rift over the land
3. The land should be divided equally between the two warring communities
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